

## ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Proposed National Communications System FY-88  
National Level Program

FROM:

D/CO

EXTENSION

NO

100-6751-86

DATE

09 SEP 1986

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. D/OIT  
2D00 HQS

2.

3. DDA /MS  
7D18 HQS4. FSDA 24 SEP 1986  
DDA 25 SEP 19865. O/Compt  
7C36 HQS

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

I understand the 20K has been put in FY88 OC budget.

While the dollar amount is not excessive for FY-88, I am concerned about the precedence this shared funding concept sets for the community. We recently had to hold the line against Latham in the DoD For satellite shared funding and NSDD-145 issues are still being worked. This pattern is disturbing.

DDA REGISTRY  
FILE: 90-1

<b>TRANSMITTAL SLIP</b>		9 Sept 86
TO: DDA		
ROOM NO. 7D18	BUILDING HQS	
REMARKS:		
FROM: D/CO		

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

02-0851-86

09 SEP 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR: Comptroller

VIA: Deputy Director for Administration  
Director of Information Technology

25X1 FROM:   
Director of Communications

25X1 SUBJECT: Proposed National Communications System FY-88  
National Level Program

REFERENCE: OC-0721-86, dated 29 July 1986, Same Subject

25X1 1. As indicated in the reference, the NSDD-97 Steering Group has been holding ongoing discussions regarding the proposed National Communications System (NCS) FY-88 National Level Program (NLP). The attachment has now been received from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and directs that NCS member organizations enter into written agreements with the Office of the Manager, NCS concerning transfer of funds to support the NLP.

25X1 2. The attachment further advises that certain costs associated with the Nationwide Emergency Telecommunications System (NETS) will be deferred until the FY-89 NLP. This occurred due to concerns raised by NCS member organizations on the viability of NETS. This deferral has resulted in a reduction in the FY-88 shared costs as previously provided.

25X1 3. The OMB direction notwithstanding, we continue to have serious concerns about the shared member funding concept. We believe it may be unworkable, difficult to manage, a laborious task to develop equitable cost sharing formulas, and certainly reduces an individual agency's ability to manage its own resources. While our portion of the funding is not excessive

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

**SUBJECT: Proposed National Communications System FY-88  
National Level Program (U)**

25X1  
25X1  
for FY-88, it will most assuredly increase in the outyears as  
NETS is developed and other initiatives are added

25X1  
4. With your concurrence, we will follow OMB guidance and enter our pro-rata cost allocation into the Office of Communications' FY-88 budget. Outyear Agency budget responsibilities will have to be the subject of future discussions. Please designate a responsible officer from your staff to assist us in completing the required agreement with NCS.

Attachment

CONFIDENTIAL



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

AUG 20 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE  
THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY  
THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR  
THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE  
THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE  
THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION  
THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY  
THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE  
CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF  
CHAIRMAN, NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
ADMINISTRATOR, GENERAL SERVICES  
ADMINISTRATION  
DIRECTOR, UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY  
ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND  
SPACE ADMINISTRATION  
ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS AFFAIRS  
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT  
AGENCY  
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY  
ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION  
CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS  
COMMISSION  
CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM  
POSTMASTER GENERAL, U.S. POSTAL SYSTEM  
MANAGER, NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

FROM:

James C. Miller **JCM**  
Director

SUBJECT:

National Communications System (NCS) FY 1988  
National Level Program Funding Guidance

As directed by National Security Decision Directive (NSDD) 201, National Security Emergency Preparedness (NSEPP) Telecommunications Funding, the NSDD-97 Steering Group has reviewed the proposed Fiscal Year 1988 National Level Program forwarded by the Manager, National Communications System (NCS).

### Funding Guidance

On behalf of the NSDD-97 Steering Group, the following approved recommendations are provided for use in preparation of the President's FY 1988 budget:

- ° The Commercial Network Survivability (CNS) Program will be funded as proposed.
- ° The Commercial SATCOM Interconnectivity (CSI) Program will be funded as proposed.
- ° Development costs for the Nationwide Emergency Telecommunications System (NETS) will be funded as proposed. Implementation/recurring costs will be funded at \$2.88M for Network Tools (Design) as contained in the NETS Program Plan (FY 1987-91). Other implementation/recurring costs will be deferred until the FY 1989 National Level Program to allow time for completion of the review directed below.

Agency funding associated with these approved recommendations is provided at Enclosure 1. Each NCS member organization's share of the Implementation/Recurring costs was determined through use of the revised NSEP Telecommunications Requirements submitted by the NCS Committee of Principals. NCS member organizations shall include their allocated funding shares in their FY 1988 budget submissions, and each organization shall work with the Manager, NCS, to develop by March 31, 1987, the necessary written agreements for the transfer of member funds to the Office of the Manager, National Communications System (OMNCS).

### NETS Review

The Manager, NCS, shall undertake a thorough review of the NETS program to determine if it is the most technically and cost effective approach for an interagency emergency communications capability to meet the policy and principles of NSDD-97. This review should be submitted in conjunction with the FY-1989 National Level Program and shall address the issues specified in Enclosure 2. Each NCS member organization should cooperate fully with the Manager, NCS, in conducting the NETS Review.

### Enclosures

FY 1988 NATIONAL LEVEL PROGRAM  
FOR  
NSEP TELECOMMUNICATIONS FUNDING

<u>NSEP Program Costs</u>	<u>Development</u>	<u>Implementation/Recurring</u>
CNS	\$ 1,910,000	\$ 1,515,000
CSI	1,278,000	7,424,000
NETS	<u>14,210,000</u>	<u>2,880,000</u>
TOTAL	\$17,398,000	\$11,819,000

NCS MEMBER AGENCY

FY 88 SHARE  
(In thousands)

Developmental Cost  
DOD

\$17,398  
\$17,398

Total Developmental

Implementation/Recurring Costs

DOS	\$ 21,227
Treasury	142,854
DOD/JCS	8,123,160
DOJ	290,871
DOI	30,980
USDA	109,005
DOC	150,886
DOT	1,999,953
DOE	170,966
CIA	20,654
GSA	290,871
USIA	24,670
NASA	71,140
FEMA	183,013
VA	114,742
NSA	0
NTIA	14,916
USPS	0
FRS	0
NRC	0
FCC	59,092

Total Recurring \$11,819,000

TOTAL \$29,217,000

Encl 1

### NETS REVIEW

1. The extent and type of NSEP telecommunication requirements to be satisfied by NETS, including whether such requirements can be satisfied by other existing or planned programs.
2. The NETS Program Risks identified by the NCS Committee of Principals, including an assessment of the severity of such risks, recommendations for reducing or eliminating them, and the costs of doing so.
3. Alternative levels of NETS capability, including an assessment of the quantity and quality of telecommunications that can be provided, the degree of survivability obtained, and the relative costs.
4. Any alternative approaches to satisfying the requirement for an interagency emergency telecommunications capability, including an assessment of the feasibility of integrating NETS capabilities into the FTS-2000, Defense Switched Network, Washington Interagency Telecommunications System and Defense Telecommunications Service-Washington TEMPO programs, and the survivability and cost effectiveness of such alternatives.

Encl 2